UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,265	04/06/2000	Haruo Machida	35.C14410	7612

5514   7590   11/21/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
GROSS, KENNETH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2122	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
09/544,265</td><td>Applicant(s)
MACHIDA, HARUO</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
Kenneth A Gross</td><td>Art Unit
2122</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-108</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-108</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1.   The information disclosure statement filed on September 7th, 2000 fails to comply with

the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because a copy of the pending U.S.

application is not submitted as required by 37 CFR 1.98 (a) (2) (iii) including the application

specification including the claims, and any drawing of the application, or that portion of the

application which caused it to be listed including any claims directed to that portion.

Furthermore, the Information Disclosure Statement fails to comply with 37 CFR (b) (3), which

requires that each U.S. application listed must be identified by inventor, application number, and

filing date. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has

not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of

any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of

any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance

with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification

requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   As per claims 25-32, 60-68, 84-88, and 104-108, merely claimed as a computer program

representing a computer listing *per se*, that is, descriptions or expressions of such a program and

that is, descriptive material *per se*, non-functional descriptive material, and is not statutory

because it is not a physical "thing" nor a statutory process, as there are not "acts" being

performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional

interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed aspects of the invention

which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. Since a computer program is

merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the program itself is not a

process, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's

functionality. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer

program defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and

the medium which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus

statutory. **Warmerdam**, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760. **In re Sarkar**, 588 F.2d 1330,

1333, 200 USPQ 132, 137 (CCPA 1978). See MPEP § 2106(IV)(B)(1)(a).

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 4, 12, 20, and 28 are objected to because of the following informalities: The term

"when an install instructions is issued selecting a peripheral device icon" should be "when an

install instructions is issued <u>upon</u> selecting a peripheral device icon", or something of the like.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   Claims 5-8, 13-16, 21-24, 29-32, 34-41, 43-50, 52-59, 61-68, and 69-88 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out

and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In regard to

Claims 5, 13, 21, and 29, the term "OS" should be spelled once in the Claims, as

terminology/acronyms are likely to be changed over time. Claims 6, 14, 22, and 30 recite the

term "said driver which is to be installed by said install function". There is a lack of antecedent

basis for this claim. Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 22, 23, 30, and 31 recite, "registering the thus extracted

setting information" which is unclear. Does this mean that the information itself is being

registered in the external device, or the driver is being registered in the external device by using

the information? Claims 34, 36, 43, 45, 52, 54, 61, and 63 recite the term "favorite window"

which is unclear. What does it mean for a window to be a "favorite"? This needs to be clarified

in the claim. Claims 37, 46, 55, and 64 recite, "should be installed" which is unclear. "Should

be" is an indefinite term. If the information should be installed, then the information will be

installed as a natural result of the steps set out in the claim. Claims 37, 46, 55, and 64 teach

installing a driver "when it is determined...that said driver setting information has not been

registered". Claims 38, 47, 56, and 65, however, contradict this statement, and teach installing a

driver "when...said driver setting information has already been registered". The term "when it is

determined," indicates that the event will definitely take place. Hence, it does not seem possible

for both events to take place. Claims 69, 74, 79, and 84 recite, "whose driver should be updated".

Should be" is an indefinite term. If the information should be updated, then the information will

be installed as a natural result of the steps set out in the claim. Claims 72, 77, 82, and 87 recite

the term "in order to register them". The term "them" is unclear. What exactly is 'them' referring

to? Claims 8, 16, 24, 32, 35, 39-41, 44, 48-50, 53, 57-59, 62, 66-68, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78, 80,

81, 83, 85, 86, and 88 are rejected for being dependent on a rejected parent Claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claim 1, 9, 17, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Pedrizetti et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,151,708).

In regard to Claim 1, Pedrizetti teaches: (a) acquiring means for acquiring the device

information of a peripheral device shared on a network (Figure 2, item 206 and corresponding

text); (b) system display controlling means for displaying a system condition of said peripheral

device (Figure 2, item 214 and corresponding text) and an icon on a user interface (Figure 6D,

item 618 and corresponding text); (c) instructing means for instructing the install of a driver for

said peripheral device in said user interface (Figure 6D, item 618 and corresponding text); (d)

install controlling means for acquiring driver setting information instructed to be installed by

said instructing means from said external device to execute the automatic install processing of

said driver (Column 12, lines 20-25).

In regard to Claims 9, 17, and 25, these claims are method, medium, and program Claims

that correspond with Claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1, where Pedrizetti

teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 2), and program (Column 14, lines 30-46).

8.   Claims 69-71, 74-76, 79-81, 84-86, 89-93, 94-98, 99-103, and 104-108 are rejected under

35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dodson (U.S. Patent Number 6,513,159).

In regard to Claim 69, Dodson teaches: (a) recognizing the version information of a

driver for a peripheral device incorporated in said information processing apparatus (Column 7,

lines 14-15); (b) acquiring means for acquiring the version information of a driver for a

peripheral device shared on said network (Column 7, lines 14-15 and Figure 1); (c) specifying

means for specifying a peripheral device which needs a driver update incorporated on the

information processing apparatus (Column 7, lines 10-13); and (d) updating means for updating

said driver for said peripheral device based on said version information recognized and acquired

(Column 7, lines 21-22).

In regard to Claim 70, Dodson teaches that a driver is installed only if the acquired

version is newer than the recognized version (Column 7, lines 57-60 and Column 8, lines 3-13).

In regard to Claim 71, Dodson teaches installing the driver from an external device

(Column 7, lines 20-22).

In regard to Claim 89, Dodson teaches: (a) receiving means for receiving update

notification including version information of a driver for a peripheral device from said external

device (Column 5, lines 29-43); (b) recognizing means for recognizing the version information

of a driver for a peripheral device incorporated in the information processing apparatus (Column

7, lines 14-15); and (c) updating means for updating said driver based on the version information

of said driver in the update notification and version information of said incorporated driver

(Column 5, lines 29-43 and Column 7, lines 57-60 and Column 8, lines 3-13).

In regard to Claim 90, Dodson teaches that a driver is installed only if the acquired

version is newer than the recognized version (Column 7, lines 57-60 and Column 8, lines 3-13).

In regard to Claim 91, Dodson teaches installing the driver from an external device

(Column 7, lines 20-22).

In regard to Claim 92, Dodson teaches that drivers are only compared if the peripheral

device that needs the driver is installed on a computer and needs an updated driver (Figure 7,

item 725 and associated text).

In regard to Claim 93, Dodson teaches that drivers are only compared if the peripheral

device that needs the driver is installed on a computer and needs an updated driver (Figure 7,

item 725 and associated text). Hence, a driver will not be updated if the peripheral for the driver

does not exist on a computer.

In regard to Claims 74-76 and 94-98, these claims are method Claims that correspond

with Claims 69-71 and 89-93 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 69-71

and 89-93 respectively, where Dodson teaches a method (Figure 4).

In regard to Claims 79-81 and 99-103, these claims are medium Claims that correspond

with Claims 69-71 and 89-93 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 69-71

and 89-93 respectively, where Dodson teaches a medium (Figure 1).

In regard to Claims 84-86 and 104-108, these claims are program Claims that correspond

with Claims 69-71 and 89-93 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 69-71

and 89-93 respectively, where Dodson teaches a program (Column 9, lines 33-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claim 2-4, 10-12, 18-20, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Pedrizetti et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,151,708) in view of Perlman et al.

(U.S. Patent Number 6,023,585).

In regard to Claim 2, Pedrizetti teaches the apparatus of Claim 1, and further teaches one

operation instruction in said user interface that installs a driver in a computer system (Column

12, lines 20-25). Pedrizetti does not teach said operation instruction installs a plurality of drivers

for a plurality of peripherals. Perlman, however, does teach installing a plurality of drivers for a

plurality of peripherals at the same time (Figure 6, item 607 and corresponding text). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to build

the apparatus of Claim 1, and further including one operation instruction in said user interface

that installs a driver in a computer system, as taught by Pedrizetti, where the one operation also

installs drivers for multiple peripherals, as taught by Perlman, since this allows for automatic

installation of multiple peripherals with minimal user intervention.

In regard to Claim 3, Pedrizetti teaches that the icon installs drivers for peripheral devices

when the icon is selected on the user interface (Column 9, 15-18).

In regard to Claim 4, Pedrizetti teaches an icon on a user interface which instructs the installation of a driver and upon selecting the icon install instructions are carried out for installing said driver (Figure 6D, item 618 and corresponding text and Column 9, lines 15-18).

In regard to Claims 10-12, 18-20, and 26-28, these claims are method, medium, and program Claims that correspond with Claims 2-4, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 2-4, where Pedrizetti teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 2), and program (Column 14, lines 30-46).

11.   Claims 5, 13, 21, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pedrizetti et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,151,708) in view of Freund (U.S. Patent Number 5,680,618).

In regard to Claim 5, Pedrizetti teaches the apparatus of Claim 1, but does not teach install shifting means to shift to an install function by an OS when said driver instructed to be installed by said instructing means cannot be acquired from an external device. Freund, however, does teach installing a default driver onto a machine, when a more appropriate driver cannot be accessed (Figure 4, items 403-405 and associated text). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to build the apparatus of Claim 1, with install shifting means to shift to an install function by an OS when said driver instructed to be installed by said instructing means cannot be acquired from an external device, as taught by Freund, since this allows the device to function even if a driver cannot be located from an external device.

In regard to Claims 13, 21, and 29, these claims are method, medium, and program Claims that correspond with Claim 5, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 5, where

Pedrizetti teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 2), and program (Column 14, lines 30-46).

12.   Claims 6, 14, 22, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pedrizetti et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,151,708) in view of Freund (U.S. Patent Number 5,680,618) and further in view of Tamura (U.S. Patent Number 6,271,454).

In regard to Claim 6, Pedrizetti and Freund teach the apparatus of Claim 5, but do not teach registering means for extracting setting information from a driver to be installed by said installing means and registering the extracted setting information in an external device. Tamura, however, does teach extracting setting information from a driver, and registering the driver (Column 22, lines 5-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to build the apparatus of Claim 5, with registering means for extracting setting information from a driver to be installed by said installing means and registering the extracted setting information in an external device, as taught by Tamura, since this allows the device to recognize the specified driver.

In regard to Claims 14, 22, and 30, these claims are method, medium, and program Claims that correspond with Claim 6, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 6, where Pedrizetti teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 2), and program (Column 14, lines 30-46).

13.   Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pedrizetti et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,151,708) in view of Tamura (U.S. Patent Number 6,271,454).

In regard to Claim 7, Pedrizetti teaches the apparatus of Claim 1, but does not teach

registering means for extracting setting information from a driver to be installed by said

installing means and registering the extracted setting information in an external device. Tamura,

however, does teach extracting setting information from a driver, and registering the driver

(Column 22, lines 5-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to build the apparatus of Claim 1, with registering means for

extracting setting information from a driver to be installed by said installing means and

registering the extracted setting information in an external device, as taught by Tamura, since

this allows the device to recognize the specified driver.

In regard to Claim 8, Tamura teaches displaying driver setting information on a display

(Column 22, lines 15-19).

In regard to Claims 15, 16, 23, 24, 31, and 32, these claims are method, medium, and

program Claims that correspond with Claims 7 and 8, and are rejected for the same reasons as

Claims 7 and 8, where Pedrizetti teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 2), and program

(Column 14, lines 30-46).

14.   Claims 33-36, 39-45, 48-54, 57-63, and 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Pedrizetti et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,151,708) in view of Hansen

(U.S. Patent Number 5,819,042).

In regard to Claim 33, Pedrizetti teaches: (a) acquiring means for acquiring the device

information of a peripheral device shared on a network (Figure 2, item 206 and corresponding

text); (b) system display controlling means for displaying a system condition of said peripheral

device (Figure 2, item 214 and corresponding text) and an icon on a user interface (Figure 6D,

item 618 and corresponding text); (c) install controlling means for instructing the install of a

driver for said peripheral device in a user network (Figure 6D, item 618 and corresponding text).

Pedrizetti does not teach that the system display displays a system condition of a user network of

the device, nor does he teach instructing to register said peripheral device in said user network.

Hansen, however, does teaches displaying a system condition of a user network of a device

(Figure 4, item 104) and registering a peripheral device on a network (Column 7, lines 7-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to construct an apparatus with acquiring means for acquiring the device information of

a peripheral device shared on a network, system display controlling means for displaying a

system condition of said peripheral device, and an icon on a user interface and install controlling

means for instructing the install of a driver for said peripheral device in a user network, as taught

by Pedrizetti, further including means for displaying a system condition of a user network of a

device and registering a peripheral device on a network, as taught by Hansen, since this allows

the device to be located and used on a network.

In regard to Claim 34, Hansen teaches displaying an overall system condition in one

window (Figure 4, item 104) and a favorite window for displaying a system condition of a user

network (Figure 4, item 106).

In regard to Claim 35, Hansen teaches that the favorite window has the icons of

peripheral devices arranged around an icon of an information processing apparatus (Figure 4,

item 106).

In regard to Claim 36, Hansen teaches registering a peripheral device by effecting the movement of the icon between a system and favorite window displayed (Column 11, lines 55-67 and Column 12, lines 1-6).

In regard to Claim 39, Hansen teaches identifying the display mode of an icon regarding an installed device between said system window and said favorite window after installing, and displaying based on the display mode (Column 12, lines 34-41).

In regard to Claim 40, Hansen teaches writing the positional information of an icon into a storing means (Column 9, lines 66-67) and arranging an displaying said icon on the basis of positional information stored in said storing means (Column 12, lines 34-41).

In regard to Claim 41, Hansen teaches instructing the movement of an icon by drag and drop (Column 7, lines 7-11).

In regard to Claims 42-45 and 48-50, these claims are method Claims that correspond with Claims 33-36 and 39-41 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claims 33-36 and 39-41 respectively, where Pedrizetti teaches a method (Figure 2).

In regard to Claims 51-54 and Claims 57-59, these claims are medium Claims that correspond with Claims 33-36 and 39-41 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons as 33-36 and 39-41 respectively, where Pedrizetti teaches a medium (Figure 1).

In regard to Claims 60-63 and Claims 66-68, these claims are program Claims that correspond with 33-36 and 39-41 respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons as 33-36 and 39-41 respectively, where Pedrizetti teaches a program (Column 14, lines 30-46).

15.   Claims 37, 46, 55, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Pedrizetti et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,151,708) in view of Hansen (U.S. Patent Number

5,819,042) and further in view of White et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,301,012).

In regard to Claim 37, Pedrizetti and Hansen teach the apparatus of Claim 36, but do not

teach executing the install processing of a driver only if the driver setting information has not

been registered. White, however, does teach installing a driver that has not been registered

(Column 2, lines 11-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to build the apparatus of Claim 36, where the install processing of a

driver is executed only if the driver setting information has not been registered, as taught by

White, since this allows only new devices to be installed with a driver.

In regard to Claims 46, 55, and 64, these claims are method, medium, and program

Claims that correspond with Claim 37, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 37, where

Pedrizetti teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 2), and program (Column 14, lines 30-

46).

16.   Claim 72, 77, 82, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Dodson (U.S. Patent Number 6,513,159) in view of Tamura (U.S. Patent Number 6,271,454).

In regard to Claim 72, Dodson teaches the apparatus of Claim 69, but does not teach

transmitting means for transmitting said version information and said driver setting information

in order to register them in an external device. Tamura, however, does teach extracting setting

information from a driver, and registering the driver (Column 22, lines 5-19) when the driver is

to be updated.

In regard to Claims 77, 82, and 87, these claims are method, medium, and program

Claims that correspond with Claim 72, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 72, where

Dodson teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 4), and program (Column 9, lines 33-49).

17.   Claims 73, 78, 83, and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Dodson (U.S. Patent Number 6,513,159) in view of Tamura (U.S. Patent Number 6,271,454) and

further in view of Hansen (U.S. Patent Number 5,819,042).

In regard to Claim 73, Dodson and Tamura teach the apparatus of Claim 69, and Dodson

further teaches acquiring means for acquiring the device information of a peripheral device

shared on a network (Column 7, lines 10-12) and install controlling means for instructing the

install of a driver for said peripheral device in a user network (Column 7, lines 21-22). Tamura

further teaches a display controlling means for displaying an overall system condition of said

peripheral device (Column 22, lines 11-15). Neither Dodson nor Tamura teaches a system

display displays a system condition of a user network of the device. Hansen, however, does teach

displaying a system condition of a user network of a device (Figure 4, item 104). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to build

the apparatus of Claim 69, further acquiring means for acquiring the device information of a

peripheral device shared on a network, install controlling means for instructing the install of a

driver for said peripheral device in a user network, and display controlling means for displaying

an overall system condition of said peripheral device, as taught by Dodson and Tamura, where

the display displays a system condition of a user network of a device, as taught by Hansen, since

this allows a user to access a peripheral on a chosen network.

In regard to Claims 78, 83, and 88, these claims are method, medium, and program

Claims that correspond with Claim 73, and are rejected for the same reasons as Claim 73, where

Dodson teaches a medium (Figure 1), method (Figure 4), and program (Column 9, lines 33-49).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Gross whose telephone number is (703) 305-0542.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on (703) 305-4552. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

KAG

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER